

REMARKS

Applicants have reviewed the present application in light of the Office Action dated November 25, 2009. Claims 1-4 and 6-20 are presented for examination, with Claim 1 being the sole independent claim. Claim 1 has been amended to define Applicants' invention still more clearly. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-4 and 6-20 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,125,354 (*MacFarlane et al.*), in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,020,628 (*Peterson et al.*). Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 1, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from the cited art for at least the following reasons.

Independent Claim 1 recites, in part, "receiving a business model file corresponding to an internal structure of the entity, the business model file including at least one application profile associating at least the following access values: (1) a time access value, (2) a geographic area access value, and (3) a user-level value with at least an identifier associated with at least a portion of the internal structure within the entity; . . . allocating respective billing portions of said billing to the portion of the internal structure within the entity based at least in part on said access values associated with the identifier," (emphasis added).

By virtue of the steps of receiving and allocating set forth in Claim 1, access values are used to allocate portions of a billing to a portion of the internal structure of the entity. The access values are associated with an identifier that is also associated with the portion of the internal structure of the entity. As a result, billing data received from a technology resource provider need not contain information about the internal structure of the entity in order for the billing to be allocated, since the billing portions can be allocated based at least in part on the access values associated with the identifier.

As best understood by Applicants, in *MacFarlane et al.* a catalog of billed charges is compiled from a database of billing information for a selected portion of an organization hierarchy (i.e., structure of the entity). See, *MacFarlane et al.*, Col. 4, lines 16-20, and Fig. 1. The cited portion of *MacPharlane et al.* at most teaches that portions of an organization's billing can be allocated to a respective portion of that organization hierarchy (e.g., an organization's branch office), but does not discuss anything about whether those allocated billing portions are based in any way on access values associated with an identifier that is associated with a portion of the internal structure within the entity. Apparently, after the billing is allocated by the respective element of the organization, the *MacPharlane et al.* invention purportedly allows an organization to adjust the allocated billing and to add miscellaneous charges to the bills before rebilling the already allocated billing to the various organizational hierarchies. See, *MacPharlane et al.*, Col. 3, lines 26-30. Indeed, the billing allocation in *MacPharlane et al.* is different from the allocation in Claim 1, where billing from a technology resource provider is received and allocated into billing portions based in part on the access values ((1) a time access value, (2) a geographic area access value, and (3) a user-level value) associated with an identifier, which is also associated with a portion of an internal structure within the entity.

Nothing has been found in *MacPharlane et al.* that is believed to teach or suggest "receiving a business model file corresponding to an internal structure of the entity, the business model file including at least one application profile associating at least the following access values: (1) a time access value, (2) a geographic area access value, and (3) a user-level value with at least an identifier associated with at least a portion of the internal structure within the entity", much less "allocating respective billing portions of said billing to the portion of the

internal structure within the entity_based at least in part on said access values associated with the identifier”, as recited in Claim 1.

Similarly, nothing has been found in *Peterson et al.* that is believed to teach or suggest the noted features of Claim 1. Accordingly, *MacFarlane et al.* and *Peterson et al.*, whether considered separately or in any permissible combination are not believed to teach or suggest the features of Claim 1, noted above.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is clearly patentable over *MacFarlane et al.*, and *Peterson et al.*, whether considered separately or in combination. Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 1 is deemed obviated, and its withdrawal is respectfully requested.

The other rejected claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual consideration or reconsideration, as the case may be, of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No petition to extend the time for response to the Office Action is deemed necessary for this Amendment. If, however, such a petition is required to make this Amendment timely filed, then this paper should be considered such a petition and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the requisite petition fee to Deposit Account 50-3939.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jonathan Berschadsky/
Jonathan Berschadsky
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 46,551

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 4384071_1.DOC